

Fall 10-22-1975

Senate Meeting October 22, 1975

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting October 22, 1975" (1975). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 292.
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/292>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

October 22, 1975

Volume VII, No. 5

Contents

Call to Order

Roll Call

Chairperson's Remarks

Administrator's Remarks

Committee Appointments

Status Report on Committee on Constitutional
and Governance Review

Civil Service Participation in Governance

Master Plan, Phase IV

Resolutions on Temporary Faculty

Committee Reports

Communications

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate.

Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

Academic Senate Minutes

Volume VII, Number 5

October 22, 1975

Call to Order

Chairperson Quane called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. in Stevenson 401.

Roll Call

The Secretary called the roll, and a quorum was declared to be present.

Chairperson's Remarks

Chairperson Quane stated that the Senators had received at the last meeting a survey questionnaire from Monte Law. He asked that Senators return the questionnaire to Monte as soon as possible.

Chairperson Quane asked the Executive Committee members to meet for a brief time after the Senate meeting.

Chairperson Quane asked all committees to try to clear their calendars as soon as possible.

Administrator's Remarks

President Budig stated that his remarks would more appropriately be included under information items 1 and 2.

Student Association President's Remarks

There were no Student Association President's remarks.

ACTION ITEM:

1. Committee Appointments

VII, 36 A motion (Long, Sullivan) to approve the committee appointments was approved.

INFORMATION ITEMS:

1. Status Report on Committee on Constitutional and Governance Review

Chairperson Quane related the history of CCGR. He stated that sometime in 1972 the Board of Regents changed their policy statements. A committee was appointed, chaired by Dr. Robert McAdam, to determine how the University should respond. This committee reported on October 11, 1972 and its report was accepted on October 25, 1972. The committee recommended that a committee be appointed to deal with conflicting matters. On January 10, 1973 President Berlo appointed a nine-member committee composed of three faculty, three students and three civil service members. On January 17, 1973, the Academic Senate ratified the appointment of this committee with certain guidelines which would assure wide publicity, communication and publication. The work of the CCGR was divided into two parts:

developing the technical changes in the ISU Constitution which would appropriately reflect BOR governing policies, and conducting a searching examination of the efficiency and desirability of the present governance structure and an exploration of alternative structures. On April 2, 1973, the final draft of the recommendations for technical changes in the ISU Constitution was presented to the Senate. In September the technical changes were approved. Between September of 1973 and the fall of 1974, the committee worked on their second task of developing a model for a revised governance system. On December 11, 1974 the Senate began discussion of the committee's work. Two major issues seemed to emerge: 1) how many lines of formal communication would be available to the President; and 2) were the various parts of the University represented in the governance proposals. On January 22, 1974 the Senate again discussed the work of CCGR. At that meeting the motion was made "to support the President's proposal regarding civil service input for a trial period and to set aside governance proposals until October 15."

Chairperson Quane stated that it seemed to him that there were two items that are appropriate for the Senate to consider: 1) is the civil service arrangement meaningful participation on their part and is it desirable; and 2) is the present model of academic governance the most acceptable or should it be changed?

2. Civil Service Participation in Governance

VII, 37

President Budig read a letter communicating the request of the Civil Service Council and the Office of the President to the Academic Senate to take appropriate action to support and ratify the arrangement of monthly meetings between the President and the Civil Service Council Executive Committee. A question was raised as to what appropriate action meant. President Budig stated that he had discussed the situation with Professor Reitan. He said at the time they were thinking of an appropriately worded resolution. It was suggested that the change should be in the form of a Constitutional amendment. President Budig said that he would leave it up to the Executive Committee or the Rules Committee to suggest an appropriate format. A motion (Cohen, Boaz) that the information item be sent to the Executive Committee for appropriate assignment and action was made. Mr. Cohen stated that he saw nothing to be gained by discussing this when appropriate committees exist to work on it. He stated that he could not envision the Senate taking any action this evening on the proposal. A question was raised if the item would have to come out as an information item again. Mr. Cohen stated that the Executive Committee could place it on the agenda as an action item, unless it is a Constitutional amendment. President Budig stated that he felt sure that Peg Leonhard, President of the Civil Service Council, would be available when it goes to committee and that he would be pleased to go to the committee. The motion to refer the item to the Executive Committee for appropriate assignment and action was approved.

VII, 38

Chairperson Quane stated that the next part of the discussion should deal with CCGR's second task, exploring alternatives to the present governance system. Mr. Cohen stated that CCGR came out of a certain time. Most of the questions seem to have been met. He suggested that the Senate discharge any further consideration of CCGR. Any other arrangements could come through more normal channels. A motion (Cohen, McMahan) to discharge this from any further consideration was made. After a friendly amendment, the motion was changed to read "to formally close further consideration of CCGR." The motion passed.

3. Master Plan, Phase IV

Chairperson Quane stated that more than a year ago the staff of the BHE began drafting a new master plan. Master Plan III, under which we are presently working, set certain goals which the University has been working toward. The Senate earlier passed a statement on the scope and mission statement of the University. Chairperson Quane stated that the Senate had received the final draft of the Master Plan IV in early October. He stated that the time frame is unusually tight. Chairperson Quane asked Stan Rives to comment on the time frame and the need for response. Dean Rives stated that the institutional response will need to be prepared for BHE by the first Monday and Tuesday in November, if we are to have a response which we are assured will be considered. Dean Rives stated that he had been working with a committee appointed by the Executive Committee in the preparation of a tentative statement because a response had to be submitted by Monday to the Board of Regents to become part of the development of a Regency System response. This tentative statement does not take the place of the institutional response.

Chairperson Quane stated that the committee appointed by the Executive Committee was composed of G. Alan Hickrod, Charles Hicklin, Gail Holmberg, Normand Madore, and Laurance Quane. Chairperson Quane stated that there would be a hearing for the University community in Stevenson 101 at 8:30 p.m. Each department was notified of the meeting and asked to notify its faculty members. After the hearing the committee will set down and will formulate the response. A special meeting of the Senate may be necessary, possibly next Thursday, as Senate-approved document will be given to the BHE on Monday, November 3.

Chairperson Quane opened the floor to discussion of MP IV. He asked that when a topic was brought up that topic be continued until there were no further questions on it.

President Budig stated that shortly after this document came out, his office drafted a letter to Mr. Furman stating that the document was unacceptable to the University. He stated that yesterday he had a meeting with Mr. Furman. President Budig stated that at that time he discussed the tentative response with Mr. Furman. He stated that he felt confident that amendments will be made which will be advantageous to the University.

The process by which the Master Plan was formulated was discussed. It was stated that there were a number of advisory committees but it was not known whether those committees really had input or whether what we are dealing with is something written by the staff. President Budig stated that the original mission statement was sent to the University a year ago. It was altered and sent back to the Board. When this draft came out, the mission statement wasn't anything close to the revised statement. President Budig stated that Ms. Holmberg might be able to add input regarding the use of advisory committees since she served on the Affirmative Action Committee. Ms. Holmberg stated that all but one of the committee's recommendations were accepted, which she considered very good in light of what a controversial item affirmative action is. Mr. Madore stated that he serves on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the BHE; he stated he couldn't find any of the Faculty Advisory Committee statement in the Master Plan.

Professor Wilson stated that clearly the most controversial aspect dealt with the institutional mission statements; this is where institutions were caught by surprise. Dean Rives commented that he had worked closely with the BHE staff to agree on an institutional mission statement. He thought there was agreement. However, what appears in MP IV is almost the staff statement that we began with. Dean Rives stated that the use the BHE staff made of the various committees varies considerably.

Mr. Hicklin was asked to comment on the staff's reasoning. Mr. Hicklin stated that his experience goes back to Master Plan I. He stated that each Master Plan he thought they couldn't get less input but they have succeeded each time. He thought Master Plan III hit rock bottom in terms of input but Master Plan IV exceeded it. He stated that this is a staff document. Many of the recommendations are things that have been kicking around for awhile. Many of them are attempts to meet emergency situations, the kind of things that are being pressed in Springfield. They are trying to prevent dorms from being built at junior colleges, for example. Mr. Hicklin stated that it was the long-standing feeling of the BHE that tuition should be raised. The staff was responding to Board feelings. Mr. Hicklin traced the evolution of ISU's mission statement. He stated that as far as he could discover the staff had taken something from the original statement -- that we should review one of our doctoral programs -- and simply expanded what was originally a remark about one Ph.D. program to all of our programs. That did not represent a widespread view on the part of the staff. Mr. Hicklin stated that the Board staff are a hard working group of harassed men and women who try to keep us honest. There are many things they could cite as background for the things that were cited in this report. He stated that they do have some telling points. Because of this fact, this document is more powerful than we think. He suggested that we not attack the document as a whole, but try to alter the minds of the decision makers where we think we can.

Mr. Tarrant asked if a recommendation would ever be made to cut out tuition. Mr. Hicklin stated that if an institution wanted to cut that amount from its budget, it could cut out tuition. He stated that the BHE was not in the tax information business and did not take a wide sociological view. Tuition is here. If you want to do away with tuition, you can if you can cut your budget by the appropriate amount. Carbondale is traditionally a low tuition school. Mr. Smith asked why on page eight there was an adamant refusal to indicate that there could be a tax increase. Why could there not be a more flexible tax appropriation request? Mr. Hicklin commented that there is no bureaucrat who is going to say that there will be a tax increase in the offing. One simply does not at this time discuss the possibility of a tax increase. The assumption is that there is not going to be any additional revenues. Whatever additional revenues are there will be due to inflationary pressures. Mr. Hickrod stated that he thought that we could rely on the percentage continuing to shrink.

Mr. Hickrod also asked about the ratio of private and public enrollment patterns which the staff document states will be the same. Mr. Hickrod stated that within the last five to six years there is more of a scramble between private and public.

It was stated that the additional help to students in private schools was part of freedom of choice. The cost of education to students in private schools should be kept level so that cost is not the sole criteria by which one determines if he/she will attend public or private schools. Part of the idea of keeping up the cost of tuition at public schools is to help the private institutions. It was stated that very few states aid private schools as much as we do. Mr. Banks stated that he agreed with Mr. Hickrod that the trend in recent years suggests a decline in enrollment in the private picture. Mr. Banks saw this policy as a desire to prevent a continuation of this trend so that both sectors can actively contribute to the education of the populace. He stated that he was reminded of our own internal situation where institutional research projections dictate decisions. This creates a self-fulfilling prophecy type of situation. Mr. Hickrod stated that we could debate at some length if the tuition forces could ever get past the General Assembly. The AAUP has always supported a modest increase in private school enrollments. My own reading of MP IV is that without continuation of this aid private schools would go under, especially if the percentage of enrollment were to continue to decline. Mr. Wilson stated that it seemed to him that in Master Plan III there was a fairly strong public support for continuing education and public service. He saw a negation of that support in this document. It was expected now that public service would be on a self-supporting basis. Individuals who want to just come in and take a course are expected to pay tuition. Mr. Wilson stated that this shift just didn't seem to make sense. Mr. Hickrod stated that the University contributes to the solution of social and economic problems of the state. That aspect is totally out of the document. Research is not supported by general revenue funds. There is no reflection that state institutions can contribute something to the community. This is a fairly sore point. Master Plan III was written when universities were reluctant to get into community activities; when FTEs began to drop, some universities went out heavily in this area in order to get extra funding, patching up FTEs with these courses. Mr. Hicklin stated that some community colleges had courses all over and they wanted reimbursement from the state for these courses. MP IV does make a decision that these will be pay as you go or met out of reallocation. The Board staff is conscious of cost studies. There are Ph.D. programs which exist which haven't turned out a candidate in five years, some very expensive programs. The staff is telling these programs to get some new constituents or to take it out of the people that are not being productive. ISU gets in a squeeze. ISU is probably one of the cleanest institutions in regard to handling of resources. Other schools are constantly being asked to look at ISU's process.

Mr. Gordon suggested that in the institutional response should be incorporated some mention of how desirable it might be to call for from our standpoint some indication of continuity between the master plans. Some fundamental continuity is needed. This plan represents a significant departure from the previous plan. Repeated 180 degree turns will make it impossible for us to respond. Continuity would not be a bad thing to have.

Mr. Madore said to place such heavy emphasis on reallocation means not to look for many new programs. It really will crimp the ease, the facility for developing new programs.

Attention was called to the statement regarding the State Universities Retirement System. It was assumed that this simply means that any partial move towards full funding is shelved. Could we insert some statement about full funding and how we disagree with this statement?

Mr. McCarthy asked if the BOR was becoming a ceremonial role and the BHE is becoming the real governing board. Mr. Quane stated that it seemed to him the Bureau of the Budget was the governing power. The statement was made that the BHE seems to want to direct a lot of power to itself. Mr. Hicklin stated that the BHE staff wishes they could get the governing board staffs to really govern. Mr. Hicklin stated that when he was down there it was quite evident that some staffs are quite weak. Therefore, it is not surprising that power is gravitating towards the BHE. Mr. McCarthy asked if the governing boards were really weak or if they just didn't agree with the BHE. Mr. McCarthy stated that the IBHE was like a public utility regulating education. The real legal hassle is whether its role is coordinating or governing.

Mr. Henry asked a question regarding agriculture. He stated that in both the Master Plan and the committee response agriculture was excluded from ever developing a masters program. He asked if there was a compelling state-wide need could such a program be developed? It was stated that such flat statements are made in several areas and could perhaps be handled in a different fashion. The possibility of cooperative programs was discussed. Mr. Henry stated that the only thing he was concerned with was the statement "regardless of need." If there is a demonstrated need for the program, then the possibility should exist.

Ms. McMahan stated that one thing which pleased her was the continued interest in affirmative action. She called attention to a significant omission; there are no affirmative action statements for the Health Education Professions. She asked the committee to jab the staff's interest on this point. Ms. Holmberg stated that she thought the reason for this was that a separate committee dealt with that area. She stated that it doubtless was an oversight.

Mr. Salome called attention to page 24 which he said was stated rather strongly. He suggested that the "can" be changed to "might."

Mr. Quane asked the senators to encourage people to attend the public hearing tomorrow evening.

4. Resolutions on Temporary Faculty

VII, 39

A motion (Smith, Hanrath) to suspend the rules in order to consider the resolutions on temporary faculty was approved.

Mr. Smith stated that he was concerned that the Senate express itself on the issue of temporary faculty. He stated that none of us were particularly happy about what could be done with the previous report. He stated that these resolutions would give some direction to administrators and department heads. He stated that the committee didn't feel that they would rewrite the whole report. Mr. Tarrant asked if this was the end of the temporary faculty issue. Mr. Smith

stated that from the discussion previously it is clear that we needed to consider how temporary faculty will be evaluated. Mr. Tarrant stated that for the time being this was it as far as this issue went. Mr. Madore stated that the Uehling Committee report is no longer under consideration. He stated that he doubted that the FAC would rewrite the report. Mr. Gordon stated that at least one college dean made reference to the fact that we have temporary faculty contracts of these various lengths. He stated that he wasn't sure what the reaction of the Senate was. Mr. Gordon stated that he wasn't quite sure where these resolutions fit. Mr. Smith stated that part of the reason for the resolution #3 was that he also heard the same statement. He felt there was some indication that the Senate should discuss part of the report. The idea was that multi-year contracts were constitutional and this kind of thing was going to go forward. He felt he should get some expression of concern regarding multi-year contracts. Mr. Gordon stated that he had a great deal of concern about that very fact. Are these two-year contracts or are they multi-year contracts? Provost Horner stated that there are no multi-year contracts. There are some instances of giving a one-year contract plus the understanding that the person will be rehired. He stated that there is no major move in that direction. The possibility of temporary faculty becoming permanent members in certain departments was discussed. Provost Horner stated that there is an immediate desire to change temporary contracts into permanent contracts. The University is currently gathering data on temporaries. Then we will begin to review department by department. Provost Horner stated that it will not be individuals who will be converted but positions. Provost Horner commented on the resolution calling for the deletion of certain things. He stated that there is nothing to delete from since the Uehling Committee report is only for the information of the committee. Mr. Rhodes asked what would happen to the colleges if they don't do these things. Mr. Hanrath suggested a friendly amendment that colleges report back regarding bringing their bylaws into conformity. Mr. Rhodes repeated his question as to what happens if we resolve this and nothing occurs. Mr. Smith stated that the bylaws had been approved by this body. He stated that he had examined the bylaws, particularly with regard to people sitting on college councils. There is no conformity among colleges. One phrase used is "continuing faculty member" without any specific explanation. Mr. Smith stated that he did check with the former head of the Rules Committee who was somewhat startled to find out that the bylaws were not in conformity with the Constitution. Mr. Eatherly, who is chairman of the College of Arts and Sciences Election Committee, stated that it would be stronger to see that departments do live up to the rules regarding persons voting. He stated that he thought a resolution would be of some use in getting colleges to follow some document. First we must get the words changed and then get the action to follow the words. It was asked if it would not be more appropriate for colleges to report to the Rules Committee. Mr. Gordon asked if data were available on how many temporary positions had been converted to permanent positions. Mr. Horner stated that such information was not readily available and would be a matter of going through file by file to determine when such transactions took place. Mr. Madore asked if the practice of converting vacant positions to temporary would continue. Mr. Horner stated that the question had not even been addressed. He stated that technically positions did convert, ususally to become permanent again when filled.

Committee Reports

Executive Committee - Mr. Hanrath stated that the Executive Committee minutes had been distributed and were self-explanatory.

Student Affairs Committee - It was stated that letters will be sent to deans and department chairpersons regarding student input into decision making. A surveillance camera statement will be distributed soon. The committee will also be discussing SCERB.

Faculty Affairs Committee - Mr. Smith reported that the Faculty Affairs Committee will continue to discuss the APT Reform Committee report.

Communications

Mr. Hanrath stated that he would like to discuss a rather gray area of budget team reporting. He stated that since early last spring the Vice Chairperson and the Secretary had sat in on budget discussions. For future reporting he suggested that a report be given at each meeting. Mr. Hanrath stated that for a great part of last spring he was the only representative actually sitting in. He stated that he was not sure how to report on past activities. He stated that he tried to gather together materials and came up with a thick book. He stated that since this is a rather large report he would suggest that he color code it and leave it available in the Senate office for perusal. He asked if this was sufficient to keep the Senate informed. It was suggested that a page or two report be distributed from time to time, since it is easier to read than to listen. Mr. Hanrath stated that you don't even start to touch concerns in this manner. He stated that he hoped the Senate would want to spend some time on it. Mr. Madore stated this is an important matter. He stated that he thought there should be a presentation when representatives of the budget team feel it would be appropriate. Mr. Rhodes stated that the information would be available to us. If a central issue came up should the budget team observers do more? Mr. Young stated that his feeling is that the Senate has so much business that to institute a report every time would be to expand the meetings. He stated that budget matters get very interesting and tricky. He stated that his own feeling is that we need the information but a report every time is not the best way. Mr. Young asked for members of the Senate to communicate to either Mr. Hanrath or Mr. Young or to the Executive Committee. He stated that he hoped the Executive Committee would come up with a way of reporting. Mr. Hickrod stated that he thought the Executive Committee should discuss the issue. The process rather than the details of the decisions is the important issue. Mr. Hanrath stated that if you believe in shared governance, then you have to look into budgeting process at greater length. Mr. Smith stated that the budgetary process is most mystifying. He stated that it would be helpful to have summary comments from both people. Mr. Hanrath stated that he did not like the summary idea because he felt we ought to have the knowledge of what happens before decisions are made. Mr. Hanrath stated that summary data doesn't even touch the surface of it. It was suggested that the Executive Committee look at the issue of budgetary reporting rather than continue the discussion now.

VII, 40 A motion (Corrigan, Madore) to adjourn was approved.

For the Academic Senate,

Robert D. Young, Secretary

NAME	ATTEN- DANCE	VOTE								VOICE VOTE		
		Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion No.	Yes	No
Amster	P									36	X	
Banks	P									37	X	
Bernardi	P									38	X	
Boaz	P									39	X	
Boldt	P									40	X	
Brubeck	P											
Carlile	A											
Carroll	A											
Chesebro	P											
Cohen	P											
Corrigan	P											
Duty	P											
Gordon	P											
Gremaud	P											
Hanrath	P											
Hickrod	P											
Henry	P											
Law	P											
Lohr	P											
Long	P											
McCarthy	P											
McMahan	P											
Madore	P											
Maxwell	A											
Natale	P											
Newman	P											
Parr	P											
Potter	P											
Quane	P											
Reitan	p*											
Rex	P											
Rhodes	P											
Salome	P											
Seely	P											
Shea	A											
Smith	P											
Stone	P											
Sullivan	P											
Tarrant	P											
Upton	A											
Van de Voort	P											
Widby	P											
Wilson	P											
Workman	P											
Young	P											
Holmberg	P											
Gamsky	P											
Horner	P											
Morris	P											
Budig	P											